

- 4 -

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 25 2006

## REMARKS

The present amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed in the above-referenced case on April 25, 2006. In the action the Examiner rejected claims 23-26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as unpatentable over U.S. 6343317 to Harry Glorikian (hereinafter Glorikian).

Firstly, the applicants wish to point out that a preliminary amendment was filed in this case on May 20, 2004, in which claims 1-22 were canceled and new claims 23-32 were added. For some reason, the Examiner has only dealt with claims 23-26, and does not mention claims 24-32.

Claims 23 is a system claim, and is rejected over Glorikian. Claims 28-32 are method claims based on the system of claim 23. In the interest of time and workload the applicant will respond to the rejection of claim 23-26, and apply the facts and reasoning as though claims 27-32 are also rejected over Glorikian.

In the rejection the Examiner quotes the applicant's claim language reciting "...a second communication device usable by an agent for one of the exhibits" and relies on element 71, Fig. 3 and column 7, line 59 through col. 8, line 10. Firstly, Fig. 1 and Fig. 3 are two separate and distinct embodiments of Glorikian's invention. Element 71 does not exist in the embodiment described with Fig. 1, and elements 29 and 31 do not exist in the embodiment described by Fig. 3. There is but one communication device for one user in the embodiment of Fig. 3. There are two communication devices shown in Fig. 1, but in all of the description of that embodiment, the two are simply separate entities treated by the network-level server the same. There is never any teaching in Glorikian about providing one of the devices with contact info for the other, and in Glorikian as a whole there is no teaching whatever for an agent associated with a specific exhibit having a communication device.

Further to the above the Examiner relies on Glorikian at col. 6, line 63 to col. 7 line 15, where Glorikian discusses that other information such as local government offices and exhibition sites is included. Since Glorikian has no agent associated with an

- 5 -

exhibition, equating "information about local government offices and exhibition sites" with a communication address for a second communication device" is a long, long stretch.

So Glorikian does not anticipate applicants' claim 23, or by the same reasoning claim 28, and dependent claims 24-27 and 29-32 are patentable at least as depended from a patentable claim.

As all of the claims standing for examination as amended have been shown to be patentable over the art of record, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and that the present case be passed quickly to issue. If there are any time extensions due beyond any extension requested and paid with this amendment, such extensions are hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with the present amendment, such fees are authorized to be deducted from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Michael Evans et al.

By Donald R. Boys  
Donald R. Boys  
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency  
P.O. Box 187  
Aromas, CA 95004  
(831) 726-1457